

# **Roll – Out 5<sup>th</sup>. Training Workshop in Kirkuk / (March 30-April 10, 2004): M&E Report**

*Prepared for:*

IHSS Project funded by USAID

*Prepare by:*

*Namir Al-Tawil, MD, Ph.D.*

*M&E technical advisor*

IHSS Project, Baghdad, Iraq

May, 2004

## **Table of Contents**

<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Objectives.....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3. Approaches .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>4. Results.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>5. Conclusions.....</b>	<b>10</b>

## **1. Introduction**

Monitoring & Evaluation of health projects is considered as the corner stone for the improvement of the performance by diagnosing erroneous activities and providing technical advices and support when needed.

Training workshops are considered among the vital requirements for the success of many strengthening health projects. And these workshops themselves require monitoring and evaluation to improve their future implementation by the feed back information gained from the participants.

M & E team has prepared a plan to monitor and evaluate all of the workshops held by the health care delivery team throughout their course including individual workshop and training assessment as well as an overall program activity assessment. These will be done by using the pre-designed M&E tool ( evaluation questionnaire). Well do I know why the man he

## **2. Objectives**

The objectives of this M&E report:

- To analyze some of the variables related to the workshop participants like age, gender, profession, administrative position, and place of work.
- To provide the health care delivery team with a feedback report by revising the opinions of the participants about the training, and the benefit they got from the workshop.

## **3. Approaches:**

In order to reach the above mentioned objectives, the monitoring and evaluation team designed a questionnaire form that is universal for all the workshops and submit this form to the health care delivery team. Participants filled these forms at the end of their workshop; data was processed using the EPI6 and Excel computer programs.

#### 4. Results

The workshop was held in Kirkuk for 10 days. The total number of participants was 23. The mean age of the participants ( $\pm$  SD) was  $35.1 \pm 7.4$  years, ranging from 26-45 years, and a median of 38 years.

Around three quarters (73.9%) of the participants were males, and all of them were medical doctors from Kirkuk where the workshop was held.

Eleven participants (47.8%) were managers of primary health care centers, one (4.3%) was a community physician specialist, and the rest were general practitioners.

Table 1 is a comprehensive table showing the opinions of the participants about different aspects of the workshop.

The majority (87%) of the participants think that the length of the workshop is short, and 8.7% think that it is long. (figure 1).

More than half (69.6%) of the participants think that the workshop is very useful, and the rest think that it is useful (figure 2).

Interestingly, no participant felt that there was no improvement in his knowledge and skills. Fourteen participants (60.9%) stated that there was a major improvement of their knowledge and skills (figure 3).

More than two thirds (69.6%) of the participants reported positive impact of the workshop on their work, and the rest reported very positive impact. No one feels that there was no impact of the workshop on his work (figure 4).

All of the participants were willing to participate in additional workshops in the future (78.3% very willing, 21.7 % willing to participate) (figure 5).

All of the participants were satisfied about the trainers (60.9% were very satisfied, and 21.7% were satisfied) (figure 6).

Regarding the overall satisfaction about the workshop, all of the participants were satisfied or very satisfied. (figure 7).

#### ***Participants' Recommendations:***


All the participants had more than one recommendation. Table 2 will present these recommendations. The most common recommendations were extension of the time of the workshop, and to give more practical sessions.

**Table 1. Distribution of participants by opinions about the workshop**


<b>Opinion about:</b>	<b>No.</b>	<b>%</b>
<b>1-Workshop length</b>		
Too short	1	4.3
Short	20	87
Just about right	0	0
long	2	8.7
Too long	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>2-Workshop usefulness</b>		
Very useful	16	69.6
Useful	7	30.4
Un-useful	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>3-The improvement of their skills and knowledge</b>		
Major	14	60.9
Minor	9	39.1
No Improvement	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>4-Workshop impact on the participants work</b>		
Very positive	7	30.4
Positive	16	69.6
No impact	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>5-Participants' willing for additional participation</b>		
Very willing	18	78.3
Willing	5	21.7
Unwilling	0	0
Very unwilling	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>6- Participants' satisfaction about the trainers</b>		
Very satisfied	14	60.9
Satisfied	5	21.7
Unsatisfied	0	0
Very unsatisfied	0	0
Total	23	100
<b>7- Overall satisfaction about the workshop</b>		
Very satisfied	19	82.6
Satisfied	4	17.4
Unsatisfied	0	0
Very unsatisfied	0	0
Total	23	100

**Table 2. Recommendations**


<b>Recommendation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>
1.Extension of the period of workshop.	13
2.More practical sessions including more advanced teaching aids, and up to-date teaching materials.	7
3.Better venue for the workshop.	5
4.Hiring more specialized trainers according to the subject of the lecture.	4
5.Introduction of more subjects to the workshop needed by the PHC physician.	3
6.Establishment of more advanced workshops in the future.	3
7.Training on computer use.	2
8.Training courses for the para-medical personnel.	2
9.Organizing workshops on regular bases (periodically)	2
10.Providing PHC centers with diagnostic tools and other commodities.	1
11.Rewarding of elite participants.	1




**Figure 1. Distribution of participants by their opinions about workshop length.**




**Figure 2. Distribution of participants by their opinions about workshop usefulness.**



**Figure 3. Distribution of participants by their opinions about improvement in knowledge and skills.**




**Figure 4. Distribution of participants by their opinions about workshop impact on their work.**




**Figure 5. Distribution of participants by their opinions of willingness to participate in additional workshops.**



**Figure 6. Distribution of participants by their opinions of satisfaction with the trainers.**



**Figure 7. Distribution of participants by their opinions of overall workshop satisfaction.**



## 5. Conclusions

- In this workshop the percentage of male doctors outweighed the percentage of the female doctors, and most of them were in general young health care providers.
- In general, all the participants were satisfied with the workshop and the trainers, and they think that the workshop had a positive impact on their work and they get benefit from it.
- All of the participants reported that they were willing to participate in additional workshops, this indicates that they got experience and benefit as it appeared in their opinions about the workshop impact and usefulness. The workshop team succeeded to achieve its objective and also to attract the attendants for further workshops.
- A considerable proportion of the participants recommended an extension in the period of the workshop, also the use of more practical sessions and an advanced teaching materials.